

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 12 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-21 remain in the application. Claims 1-15 and 17-20 have been amended, and claim 21 is new. The Applicant submits that the amendments are supported by the written specification and referenced drawings. The Applicant contends that, by the present submission all bases of objection and rejection have been overcome. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

SUMMARY OF ACTION FROM THE OFFICE

1. In the Office Action Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.
2. In the Office Action Claims 1-7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan et al. (4,396,221).

In the Office Action Claim stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King (3,711,893).

3. In the Office Action claims 1-22 stand rejected on the basis of nonstatutory double patenting in regards to U.S. Patent No. 7,100,328.

4. In the Office Action claim 17 stands rejected on the basis of nonstatutory double patenting in regards to U.S. Patent No. 7,024,822.

ARGUMENT

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

1. In the Office Action Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Applicant hereby requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

2. In the Office Action Claims 1-7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan et al. (4,396,221).

The Applicant hereby requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 12 2007

In the Office Action Claim stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King (3,711,893).

The Applicant hereby requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

3. In the Office Action claims 1-22 stand rejected on the basis of nonstatutory double patenting in regards to U.S. Patent No. 7,100,328.

The Applicant hereby requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

4. In the Office Action claim 17 stands rejected on the basis of nonstatutory double patenting in regards to U.S. Patent No. 7,024,822.

The Applicant hereby requests reconsideration based on the enclosed amendments.

Due to the extensive nature of the amendments provided in an effort to more succinctly define the presently claimed invention, the Applicant hereby reserves the right to argue over the references of record and has not agreed with the Office's interpretation of the references as such arguments may be moot in light of the amended claims.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submits that all bases for rejection have been overcome by the present amendment and above arguments, and respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Dean B. Watson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,242
(248) 299-2889

Dated: April 12, 2007